

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/759,931  <b>Examiner</b> AMEE A. SHAH	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ANDERS ET AL.  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><b>Art Unit</b> 3625</td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Art Unit</b> 3625	
<b>Art Unit</b> 3625				

  

**All Participants:**

(1) AMEE A. SHAH.

(2) DAVID MIMS.

**Date of Interview:** 18 March 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**  
*pending 101 rejection*

**Claims discussed:**  
 4, 9

**Prior art documents discussed:**  
*n/a*

**Status of Application:** after appeal

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 2:20 pm

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*Mr. Mims agreed to examiner's suggested amendments of claim 4 to be in a machine to significant steps of the method to pass the Bilski machine or transformation test and make the claims patent-eligible under 101. Claim 9 depends from claim 4 and thus required no amendment.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)